## AESTHETIC ANALYSIS OF A PARAN ĀMAD IN KATHAK\*

## Sushil Kumar Saxena

Paran āmad is one of the common intra-forms (or items)¹ that make a Kathak recital. It is an essay in pure dance. That is, it is not 'about' anything in outer reality. Nor does it seek to express any emotion. Its charm lies wholly in the way it squares ang with the (formal character of) bols, and in its handling of rhythm. I seek in this article to see how the 'look' of a paran āmad depends on the character and knitting of its syllables, and on the accord of this syllabic content with bodily figuration (अंग बनाना). It would help understanding if I distinguish the art-elements here involved: the basic rhythm (as marked by the lahrā-thekâ twosome), the individual character—both audile² and rhythmic—of the bols, their order, the intervals that hold the segments apart, changes of pace, and the demands of syllables in respect of bodily aptness. Let me now cite the pattern in its syllabic and rhythmic form:

Perhaps the most obviously likeable feature of this composition is its terminal definiteness. Those who care only for the inner intricacy of long and involute rhythmic patterns often tend to be casual in respect of ang relating to the termini. Such indifference is hardly proper, for it is bound to detract from the overall appeal of the recital. Every pattern as danced should

<sup>\*</sup>This essay is a rough extract from my talk: 'Aesthetics of Kathak and Birju Maharaj' given at Bharat Bhavan, Bhopal, on 7.7 '84 as a part of 'Birju Maharaj Prasang'.

Why I prefer the word 'intra-form' to item has already been explained by me in my essay: 'Kathak-Some Terms and Distinctions' in Sangeet Natak, No. 51.

This means 'relating to hearing'. So it covers the bols as recited (or in पढ़-त), as played
by the drummer and as danced. Their own character, however, is manifest most truly
in parhant or recitation.

seem to be self-complete. Otherwise the total performance will become too loose and flowing, and deficient in inner clarity. Its content will tend to appear a jumble. The risk of such ferminal vagueness of ang and rhythmic form is minimized if, as in the pattern under review, the ends are provided by open bols like 'ता' and 'घा'. I do not wish to hold that these are the only permissible aksharas to serve as terminal endings. As we know, there are many good patterns which begin and end differently. But, in so far as the essence of Indian classical dance is not mere movement (as against action)3 but movement with some semblance of accordant ang-a requirement from which perhaps only गिनती के तोड़े are exempt—where the terminal bols (or syllables) are not themselves open and definite, extra care will have to be taken-may be, by way of emphatic drumming, parhant or gestural incisiveness—to provide clarity to the two ends. In any case, the intrinsic character of the first and the last bols has to be kept in mind. From this point of view, धिननन provides a better opening—because it is more insistent—than, say, तिकधा; and as the final bol, धा is preferable to थेई unless the latter is demanded to consummate a तिया or is projected by means of specially attractive ang. It may here be noted that in some Kavitta-s the 'घा' of 'राधा' as a closing word serves this purpose as well, that is, of helping the seeming self-completion of the intra-form.

But if it is to seem articulate on the inside, a pattern should reveal clear segments, each with its own clear beginning and end. Otherwise it will lack inner intervals and so give no room to ang to unfold itself. Long stretches of लड़ी बन्द syllables are therefore to be kept out, for they just do not permit the beauteous variety of bodily configuration that good dancing needs, even where it is nritta; they tend to restrict dance to mere liquid movement. This is so where the pattern presented draws too heavily upon syllables like दि ग दिग. My own view is that if the key requirement of winsome bodily shapes is to be kept in mind, a tuft of लड़ी बन्द syllables is desirable only to the extent to which it provides a foil to, and so heightens the heldapart look or relaxed distinctness of bols that come before or after it.

Going by such criteria, I find the āmad in question admirable. It opens with three clear segments (from the first to the twelfth beat) that give full room to ang; and their end-side bols are all unmistakable: घा, ता, गा. What is more, the formal character of some bols here demands a measure of depth in ang. I have in mind, as I so speak, the letters चुं and चिं with their nasal ring. चो is merely open and a little round. चुं is different, specially as coupled with गा; it demands a suggestion of depth, or inwardness in ang. Similarly, चिंता is different from, and demands a fuller ang than चिंता.

<sup>3.</sup> Common instances of 'action' represented in Kathah are: lifting the mount (Goverdhan) on the little finger in गोर्बर्धन की गत and crushing the hood of (the serpent) kaliya in the pattern which projects कालिया दमन. But whereas bodily movements are here obviously involved, in pure dance no 'action' is represented. So movement, not action, is essential to dance. But in our classical dance movement has to accord with bols.

SANGEET NATAK 18

We have to heed such differences. Otherwise, what is the point in at all having bols of diverse character in addition to beats?

Here, in the āmad under review, a string (or लड़ी) of rapid syllables occurs only once, covering but 6 beats roughly; it is: तिकटतका तिटकतगविगिन. The syllables that forerun and follow it are all clearly slower in pace. So the little spurt does not cancel, but only serves to heighten by contrast the āmad's overall impressiveness, a quality which is seen in the very way the intra-form opens, its first three segments all beginning with भा which is perhaps the Kathak's key syllable to make an accent unmistakable.

Another point may be made in respect of the syllabic string (or ল্বর্রা). in question. It is on the one hand impressive because of its filling and pace; but on the other hand, because none of its constituent bols is open and assertive, it does not appear heavy or bold. So it goes well with both the preceding pakhāwaj bols and the gentler ones of dance that follow it. In a way, it partakes of the character of both kinds of syllables that it conjoins: the pakhāwaj and the dance bols, and therefore, though it serves as a link quite well, it does not seem to jut out, and leaves the pattern phenomenally one.

But am I right in affirming that it is good as a link? I believe, yes; and this not only because of its character as relief which I have already spoken of, but because the manner of its neighbouring bols on either side seems adapted to the link. Let me make it clear. The third segment वाचिता is clearly brief. It may be expected to give the dancer breathing-time to get set for the bigger bunch of bols; चित्रा...चुंगा, which, in turn, paves the way for dancing the next, but longer and quicker knitwork of bols, that is, the link we have been speaking of: तिकट... गिन. The ता that follows गिन immediately appears aesthetically apt not only because the adjacence of a closed and an open sound provides likeable contrast, but because the spurt needs a point of return to the basic pace.

This pace, be it noted, is set by the very deliberateness of the first bol's utterance. The चा which opens a pattern is of necessity steady. Its own inner laya cannot be drut. If out of impatience to move ahead to the other following bols we try to utter this syllable quickly, its mātrā gets cramped, and so its literal character is negated. As it is, even the immediately following तक is here fairly steady. I admit that this bol, तक, is in the present intra-form not to be uttered stiffly, that is, with its second letter, क cut off firmly and abruptly. But nor is it to seem, I rejoin, clearly relaxed in the manner of तक or as ending with a kind of upward twist, say, in the way of तका. The right manner of uttering the bol in question here is identical with the way we articulate the word तक in sentences of the following kind: 'चलो, जरा बहां तक चूम आये. In other words, it is fairly steady. If, merely with a view to producing something different, one changes this everyday manner into an upturning and

lightly uttered तका it would be clearly inconsistent (in pace) with the steadiness of the opening घा, as also with the amad's overall look of dignity. That the pattern is meant to so look is unquestionable. It is indeed the clear demand, as I have suggested, of the liberal use of घा, and of hindis in युगा and घिता which demand a measure of depth in ang; and of the very intervals between the segments distinguished which permit and invite an opening of ang.

We may also see how, in the pattern under review, the very formal character of bols, where it does not expressly demand a bold and open ang, at least goes well with such a disposition of the body. Syllables like षा and ता just do not permit figural compression. But what deserves emphasis, because it is commonly ignored, is the fact that many of the syllabic pairs here seem to open, because whereas the first akshara or bol is subdued or 'closed' (or इकार या उकार का) the immediately following one is open. Thus, see here the following: युंगा, दिगता, धिता, धिता, तक्का, तकिटतका. A dominance of bols like दिग दिग धेई would here blight the very essential character of an āmad which is a kind of formal openness or flowering.

I may now focus on some points I have so far hinted in respect of Kathak aesthetics:

In respect of a bol's own character there is one more hint which I have thrown incidentallly. Just as the body may seem to be taut, relaxed or upturned, so can a dance-syllable. It is therefore by no means improper to speak of the ang of a bol itself. I have, for instance, distinguished three states of the ang of the syllable and, besides its look when we utter the word simply in the sense of 'upto'. These three are: and (pronounced briefly and stiffly), and and and. The principle is that in actual dance such little differences have to be kept in mind. Otherwise, the cardinal requirement of ang-bol accordance will be disobeyed.

SANGEET NATAK 20

Intensive though it fairly is, it would be wrong to suppose that my analysis of the paran āmad in question is exhaustive. I have missed a vital point which may now be mentioned. In a whole Kathak recital the net 'look' of an intra-form cannot but (in part) be determined by what precedes and follows it. A thhāt enables the Kathak to gently slip into the region of dance, transfiguring the body as it is into what it should be in accordance with the needs of the art. A paran āmad, on the other hand, appears to proclaim, in a way, the advent of dance; for, the two most essential elements of Kathak—responsiveness of ang to the demands of bols, and the flow of rhythm as both an even ground and as a decorative upsurge—are here for the first time manifest.